Appeal: 13-8022 Doc: 16 Filed: 03/05/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-8022

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GEORGE LALOUDAKIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (1:09-cr-00608-RDB-5; 1:13-cv-00467-RDB)

Submitted: February 27, 2014 Decided: March 5, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George Laloudakis, Appellant Pro Se. Debra Lynn Dwyer, Assistant United States Attorney, Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

George Laloudakis seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Laloudakis has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

Appeal: 13-8022 Doc: 16 Filed: 03/05/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED